## **United States Court of Appeals FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

\_\_\_\_\_

	No. 01-2343
United States of America,	* *
Appellee, v.	<ul> <li>* Appeal from the United States</li> <li>* District Court for the District</li> <li>* of Nebraska.</li> </ul>
Armando Lopez-Lopez,	* [UNPUBLISHED] *
Appellant.	*

Submitted: October 25, 2001

Filed: November 8, 2001

\_\_\_\_\_

 $Before\,McMILLIAN, FAGG, and\,MORRIS\,SHEPPARD\,ARNOLD, Circuit\,Judges.$ 

## PER CURIAM.

Armando Lopez-Lopez challenges the sentence imposed by the district court\* after Lopez-Lopez pleaded guilty to drug-conspiracy and money-laundering charges. Counsel has filed a brief and moved to withdraw under <u>Anders v. California</u>, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Although we granted Lopez-Lopez permission to file a pro se supplemental brief, he has not done so.

<sup>\*</sup>The Honorable Richard G. Kopf, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Nebraska.

Counsel argues that the district court committed error by increasing Lopez-Lopez's base offense level for possession of a dangerous weapon. We disagree. In our view, the district court correctly applied the enhancement in light of a witness's testimony that Lopez-Lopez held up his gun and warned her, "[Y]ou know what we do to narcas." See U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1, comment. (n.3) (adjustment should be applied if weapon was present, unless it is clearly improbable weapon was connected with offense); United States v. Behler, 187 F.3d 772, 777 (8th Cir. 1999) (district court's assessment of credibility is "virtually unreviewable"; clear-error standard).

Having reviewed the record independently in accordance with <u>Penson v. Ohio</u>, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), we find no other nonfrivolous issues. Thus, we grant counsel's motion to withdraw, deny as moot Lopez-Lopez's motion for appointment of appellate counsel, and affirm the district court.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.